

Application No: 17-01-020, et al.

Exhibit No.: _____

Witnesses: Brian Warshay

**OPENING TESTIMONY OF BRIAN WARSHAY ON BEHALF OF TESLA, INC ON
MEDIUM/HEAVY DUTY AND FLEET CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE**

Brian Warshay
Tesla, Inc.
444 De Haro Street, Suite 101
San Francisco, CA 94107
Tel: 650.963.5100 ext.58579
bwarshay@tesla.com

August 1, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. The Proposed Program Requirement for New Dedicated Service Connection for all MD/HD EV Infrastructure Should be Modified to Allow Customers an Option to Utilize Existing Service Connections	1
A. SCE’s and PG&E’s Proposal to Require New Service Connections for All MD/HD EVs Participating in Their Programs Restricts Customer Choice	2
B. Requiring New Service Connections as a Prerequisite for Program Funding Would Make it More Challenging for Customers to Optimize Onsite Renewable Generation and Storage....	3
C. Allowing MD/HD EV Charging on Existing Service Connections Will Result in Lower Costs to Ratepayers and Lower Costs for EV Charging	4
D. The Commission Should Direct SCE and PG&E to Allow MD/HD EVs to Participate in Their MD/HD EV Infrastructure Programs Under Existing Service Connections.	5
III. Conclusion	5

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 In accordance with the April 13, 2017 “Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned
3 Commissioner and Administrative Law Judges,” (Scoping Memo) Tesla, Inc. (Tesla) submits the
4 testimony of Brian Warshay on Pacific Gas and Electric’s (PG&E) FleetReady proposal and
5 Southern California Edison’s (SCE) Medium and Heavy-Duty Charging Infrastructure Proposal.
6 Brian Warshay’s qualifications are attached as Appendix A.

7 Overall, Tesla appreciates the investor owned utilities’ (IOUs) incorporation of medium-
8 duty and heavy-duty electric vehicles (MD/HD EVs) within the standard review proposals. As
9 indicated in Tesla’s reply brief on the priority review projects, in order for future growth and
10 eventual widespread deployment to occur, significant investment in these sectors over the next
11 several years will be necessary. Testimony below therefore focuses on a specific program
12 implementation concern for the SCE and PG&E proposals with regards to service connections
13 that should be addressed prior to Commission approval.

14 **II. THE PROPOSED PROGRAM REQUIREMENT FOR NEW DEDICATED**
15 **SERVICE CONNECTION FOR ALL MD/HD EV INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD**
16 **BE MODIFIED TO ALLOW CUSTOMERS AN OPTION TO UTILIZE**
17 **EXISTING SERVICE CONNECTIONS**

18 Both SCE and PG&E propose to require that new dedicated service connections be
19 created for MD/HD EVs participating in their MD/HD infrastructure programs.¹ However, some

¹ “SCE plans to install a separately-metered circuit together with utility transformer upgrades, service drop, panel, trenching, wiring, conduit, and step-down transformer,” SCE Testimony, p. 52, lines 9-11. “PG&E will design the infrastructure to provide dedicated electric service to that location by following PG&E’s established procedures for new service connections. The service connection will be used exclusively for the charging infrastructure and will require dedicated meters and electric panels to the charging bank,” PG&E Testimony, p. 3-12, lines 14-20.

1 customers that procure MD/HD EVs will be capable of charging their vehicles from the existing
2 service provided to a facility, such as an office building or warehouse, which would reduce the
3 amount of infrastructure the utilities must build to support the MD/HD EVs and thus reduce the
4 overall costs of deploying the charging infrastructure.

5 SCE's and PG&E's proposal to require new service connections for charging infrastructure
6 in their programs (1) restricts customer choice, (2) makes it more challenging to integrate onsite
7 renewables and (3) would result in higher costs to ratepayers and some customers electrifying
8 their fleets. The proposed programs, designed to encourage deployment of electric fleets, will
9 likely see greater adoption if customers have more options with which to schedule fleet charging
10 to minimize electricity costs. The proposed program requirement for a new service connection
11 would restrict a customer's ability to receive utility program funding for substantial behind-the-
12 meter infrastructure such as the conduit, wires, panel, and electric vehicle supply equipment
13 (EVSE) if the customer chooses to install equipment behind an existing service connection.
14 Therefore, Tesla recommends that the Commission instruct the utilities to alter their proposals to
15 allow customers the option to charge their EVs under their existing electric service as part of the
16 utilities' MD/HD EV infrastructure programs.

17 **A. SCE's and PG&E's Proposal to Require New Service Connections for All MD/HD**
18 **EVs Participating in Their Programs Restricts Customer Choice.**

19 Both SCE and PG&E propose to require new service connections and separate metering
20 for all MD/HD EVs participating in their programs.² However, not all MD/HD EV charging will
21 require new service connections. In some cases, MD/HD EV owners will have facilities with
22 remaining capacity on their existing service connections, particularly if they are large facilities

² *Ibid.*

1 like factories or warehouses. For these sites, customers' decisions between rate options, charging
2 schedules, and infrastructure deployment (i.e., number of chargers on a site) can make or break a
3 business case for a fleet deployment. Limiting rate options and the ability to choose how
4 infrastructure is connected due to relatively arbitrary program limitations reduces a customer's
5 flexibility and ability to deploy the most cost-effective charging capabilities. Most commercial
6 and industrial facilities with EVs will schedule charging (1) to avoid the facility's peak demand
7 and (2) during off peak energy rate periods because of clear price signals from existing rate
8 structures. Customers that have remaining capacity on their existing service connection or are
9 able to charge EVs dynamically to avoid needing a new service connection should not be
10 required to have dedicated new service connections to participate in the utilities' MD/HD EV
11 programs.

12 **B. Requiring New Service Connections as a Prerequisite for Program Funding Would**
13 **Make it More Challenging for Customers to Optimize Onsite Renewable Generation**
14 **and Storage.**

15 Customers electrifying their fleets may also consider incorporating renewable generation
16 and storage onsite to offer clean electricity to fuel EVs. Requiring new service connections,
17 metering, and rate plans for the charging infrastructure separate from the building may end up
18 reducing the overall benefits of a solar and storage system to the customer due to a suboptimal
19 system design, suboptimal tariff optimization, and additional administrative costs. Typically, a
20 solar and storage system is designed to maximize savings (or minimize costs) associated with a
21 load forecast and utility rate tariff. Separate metering for a building and charging infrastructure
22 may require project development, design, sizing, and interconnection for *two* systems based on
23 *two* load profiles on *two* rates rather than one, significantly complicating the project and likely
24 resulting in higher overall costs. A single solar and storage system serving a combined building

1 and charging load could share resources and benefit from the economies of scale of having a
2 single large system rather than two smaller systems.

3 **C. Allowing MD/HD EV Charging on Existing Service Connections Will Result in**
4 **Lower Costs to Ratepayers and Lower Costs for EV Charging.**

5 It is important to allow customers to utilize their existing service connections for EV
6 charging when there is capacity on the service connection because it is less expensive both for
7 ratepayers funding and the customers utilizing the MD/HD EV programs.

8 *Ratepayer Savings:* The cost of new service connections is quite significant – of the
9 \$11.6 million in capital that PG&E proposes to spend on HD Truck and Transit Buses \$7.4
10 million, or 64%, is for the service connection.³ Allowing MD/HD EV operators to fully utilize
11 existing service connections when possible is a more efficient use of infrastructure than requiring
12 the utility build out new service connections due simply to program design. This will streamline
13 the use of ratepayer funds to provide the most value to the overall market to spur MD/HD EV
14 adoption.

15 *Customer Savings:* Allowing the EV charging infrastructure to take service under
16 facilities' existing service connections provides customers with more options to reduce their
17 charging costs thus improving the economics of switching from fossil fuel to electric vehicles.
18 Some customer buying MD/HD EVs will have the flexibility to minimize the overall cost of
19 charging by scheduling vehicle charging to have the least impact on the demand portion of the
20 facility utility bill. This can be done by scheduling charging at times when it is not coincident
21 with their facility's peak demand. By minimizing the demand charge impact, the incremental

³ PG&E Data Request Response to Office of Ratepayer Advocates: FleetReady Workpapers, April 24, 2017, at 4A-4B.

1 cost of charging MD/HD EVs will be only the variable energy cost of electricity paid for a
2 \$/kWh basis. This would make charging in most cases much less expensive than if the customer
3 had to pay an additional demand charge on the account of the new service connection.

4 Smart charging schedules will increase site load factors while limiting the impact on peak
5 demand. This will result in higher utilization of existing utility infrastructure and lower charging
6 costs to both the individual customers participating in the programs as well as all customers who
7 are funding the programs.

8 **D. The Commission Should Direct SCE and PG&E to Allow MD/HD EVs to**
9 **Participate in Their MD/HD EV Infrastructure Programs Under Existing Service**
10 **Connections.**

11 The Commission should direct SCE and PG&E to alter their programs to allow customers
12 that want to install MD/HD EV charging infrastructure on an existing service connection to
13 participate in the utilities' MD/HD EV infrastructure programs. Absent such a change, the
14 utilities' MD/HD EV infrastructure deployment will be less economically efficient due to an
15 administrative program requirement rather than a business or system need. This subtle change
16 will offer customers more options to optimize the charging schedule of their MD/HD EVs, create
17 more opportunities for the integration of onsite renewable generation and storage, and reduce
18 costs to ratepayers and site owners alike resulting in greater deployment of electrified fleets.

19 **III. CONCLUSION**

20 With the modifications recommended in Section II of this testimony, PG&E and SCE
21 MD/HD proposals will be improved to help meet the statutory objectives of Senate Bill (SB) 350
22 and the September 14, 2016 Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR) in Rulemaking (R.) 13-11-
23 007.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian Warshay

Brian Warshay
Tesla, Inc.
444 De Haro Street, Suite 101
San Francisco, CA 94107
Tel: 650.963.5100 ext.58579
bwarshay@tesla.com

10 Dated: August 1, 2017

APPENDIX A – STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR BRIAN WARSHAY

1 Brian Warshay is a Senior Analyst on Tesla’s Product Economics and Grid Services team. His
2 work focuses on the value of distributed grid resources, retail rate reform, and smart energy
3 home devices, including solar and battery storage to support Tesla’s ongoing efforts to deploy
4 distributed energy resources that can provide grid services. Previously, Brian led the North
5 American Energy Smart Technologies team at Bloomberg New Energy Finance and the Grid
6 Storage team at Lux Research. Brian received his master’s degree in Engineering Systems and
7 Management at the Masdar Institute in Abu Dhabi, and undergraduate degrees in Natural
8 Resources and Environmental Engineering Technology at Cornell University.